



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, MARCH 19, 1910

No. 20

Readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, who so often hear the criticism of the work in Prose Composition, may be interested in reading the following piece of writing. The author, a senior in a High School, had been reading a cowboy story in the school paper during study period, and had been told to report the story in Latin. Here is his report, just as he handed it in:

SMITHUS TORTUS CRINEM.

Jacobus Smithus pastor in Bar S pastorali agro fiebat. Peritissimus huius operis mox erat. Proximo mense Smithusque reliqui (*sic*) pastores exierunt ut pecus cogerent. Illis profectis, graviter ningere coepit. Manus desertam domum petivit. Hic Cal dux narravit se a homine (*sic*) Lasalle cognomine fere falsum esse. Ea re audita, Smithus commotus, equo ascenso, caeruleam domum Lasallis per magnam nivem perque severum frigus petivit. Hic postquam diu et acriter pugnatum est, Smithus Lasallem interfecit.

Some notes may be in place: *tortus crinem* = 'curly'; *pastorali agro* = 'ranch'; *pecus cogere* = 'round up'; *caeruleam domum* = 'the dark green house'. It may perhaps be doubted that the work was done independently. This, however, is the fact, the only help used being an English-Latin dictionary for the word *ningere*.

But aside from the fun to be had from this clever piece of work, it arouses some serious reflections. The wretched results of our instruction in prose work are but too well known, and are at the present time made the subject of an inquiry. I am not now concerned in discussing methods of teaching, but I wish to ask our readers, and the authorities who write text books on composition and examination papers, whether it might not be worth while to try to break away from the usual rehash of phrases and clauses, and give our students some real mental pabulum, which might contribute toward a realization of the fact that the Romans were actually living beings with feelings and desires like our own. I know I am not the only one who has that secret thought. A recent text book on prose composition for College Freshmen makes the attempt, defective as it may be, to infuse life into its exercises. When I was teaching Greek—*aurea illa Saturni aetate*—I used to assign to my Homer class a chapter in Xenophon for review, and then send the boys to the blackboard, dictating to them a modern story, say about mountain climbing or the like, based on the vocabulary of the chapter studied. While the

results, at first, were largely comical, the boys soon took to the idea with great pleasure, and became really quite proficient in thus expressing ideas of their own life in the ancient form. At present, I am engaged in a similar attempt with a seventh term class. After the regular prose lesson has been done, we close books, and I give the boys, orally, a simplified biography of Vergil, which they render into Latin, sentence by sentence. We make up our vocabulary, most frequently, by reference to the works of Caesar and Cicero, which I quote to them and lead them to form their phrases from these. While the boys at first were very timid about coming forward, they have now come to like the idea very much, and I hope to continue the work with them in their last term in a more extended fashion. I do not want to be misunderstood: this is no mere clown's work, an artificial stimulant of interest. Each sentence has been carefully thought out to contain some syntactical principle. I confess that I have been inspired to undertake the work by remembering my own boyhood. Our copy books in penmanship, even, contained information, moral and mental, and among my most treasured recollections from the Gymnasium are those hours in the upper forms, when we struggled with newspaper articles on timely topics, which were assigned to us as prose tests. Of course, the work in this country will have to be much more simple, but I am convinced that it can be done, and will contribute its mite toward kindling a flame of love for the Classics, which now is so sadly smothered under the farrago of inane verbiage. If these lines shall excite a discussion in the columns of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, I shall be more than pleased, and am quite willing to take a sound drubbing if I can be proven to be in the wrong.

E. R.

HALFLIGHTS IN ANCIENT LITERATURE

HERMAGORAS

We American classicists have not, as yet, done much towards the elucidation of problems connected with ancient rhetoric. Our instructors in declamation and rhetoric are as a rule innocent of Aristotle. Our productive classicists too, in the main, follow the groove of college reading and let Cicero alone. Writers on Ancient Art, too, trained archaeologists though they often be, know not that

the abundant allusions to the parallels of art and literary style were evolved in the rhetorical schools and so are found in Aristotle, Theophrastus, Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian—an academic tradition of the rhetorical schools.

In the history of ancient rhetoric a conspicuous position was gained by Hermagoras of Temnos. I have taken him up for a paper because, in a searching study of Cicero's rhetorical treatises, I have discovered considerable confusion as to Hermagoras's work and time; in fact, I believe that even Otto Jahn and W. Christ (Griech. Literaturgeschichte³, 750) and the editors of Cicero's Brutus generally, have been led into error by certain mistakes in their interpretation of the extant data of classic tradition. Westermann too, seems to have been confused, as was R. Volkmann. Utterly confused too is the article Hermagoras in Orelli's Onomasticon Tullianum. Compare also the short article by B. in the Old Pauly. Pauly-Wissowa has not yet reached this word. In the Suidas articles *our* Hermagoras is fused with Hermagoras Karion, who taught rhetoric and style in Rome with Caecilius of Cale Akte, friend of Dionysius, in the reign of Augustus, and lived to great age.

Blass, in his noted monograph of 1865, (p. 278), divides the entire history of the development of Greek rhetorical *τέχνη* into *three* periods or movements, thus: 1) The Pre-Aristotelian, from Gorgias to Isocrates; 2) the Aristotelian, brusquely opposed to the Isocratean School; 3) "The third kind (Gattung) was established in the second century by Hermagoras of Temnos; its characteristic element is the barren subtlety on account of which Spengel has very aptly called it the *scholastic* (kind); it prevailed down to the end of classical antiquity and of Greek literature". The chief point of eminence in the historical place of Hermagoras however, must not be belittled before it is at all understood or perceived afar off. Even in St. Augustine's *τέχνη* and in Isidorus we still find it as essential and important. In fact it seems that the former, as teacher of rhetoric, in his pre-Christian period, in Africa, Rome and Milan, cited Hermagoras, often using the technical terms in the original Greek; probably before 387.

The contribution of Hermagoras to ancient rhetoric is this: He devised certain categories of *position* (*στάσεις*), to some of which every case of the pleader's experiences may or rather *must* be assigned. The doctrine of *status* then became so obstinately important, because it furnished, as it were, a practical and useful bridge from the theory of the schools to the practice of the courts. It classified the possible points at issue between prosecution and defense (*τὸ κρινόμενον*) I do not, of course, intend here to rewrite any chapter of Volk-

mann. There is no reason for doubting that young Cicero in his *torso* (De Inventione) book 2 presents in the main a Latinization of the *τέχνη* of his Greek rhetor or rhetors (he heard no others).

Just *when* in the Cinna period of Roman annals young Cicero put forward this book, even after Marx on Cornificius (I have no hesitation on the score of the name), will remain somewhat undefinable.

In the introduction to Book II indeed young Cicero somewhat boastfully tries to create the impression that he has had not *one* source, but like Zeuxis (when he painted his Helena for the people of Croton), has brought together his excellences from many books. He had indeed before him or near him Aristotle's *Συναγωγή τεχνῶν*. This seems to explain his somewhat specious phrase of the many *ἐργαῖς*.

The parallels with Cornificius point to a single source. In fact Quintilian's references (3. 6. 59, etc.) to the youthful work of Cicero are familiar: They are reprinted in all the manuals. But to go on: As for the maturer Cicero, with his outward disdain of mere *τέχνη* he still returns to *status* again and again, e.g. De Orat. 1. 139-140; 2. 104 ff., 132 ff.; Orator 45, 121; Partitiones 34, 41, 42; Topica 50, 51, 87, 92, 93. Cicero also delineates a theory of *status* for *deliberatio* and *laudatio*. Unfortunately Cicero had not consulted Volkmann.

In his own maturity and power Cicero referred but twice more to Hermagoras by name: 1) in Brutus 263 (when Cicero was sixty years of age); C. Licinius...quaestorius mortuus est; probabilis orator, iam vero etiam *probatas ex hac* (now present and everywhere prevailing) *inopi ad ornandum, sed ad inveniendum expedita Hermagorae disciplina*. Ea dat rationes certas et praecepta dicendi; quae, si minorem habent apparatus (sunt enim exilia) tamen habent ordinem et quasdam errari in dicendo non patientes vias.

The other reference is Brutus 271. Speaking of T. Accius of Pisaurum (his opponent in the Cluentius case) he says: Qui et accurate dicebat et satis copiose eratque praeterea *doctus Hermagorae praeceptis*. He does not say *a Hermagora doctus*. Even as a young man Cicero could acquire this doctrine of *status*, without abstaining from criticism in other respects. The freedom of censure and the rather scanty measure of praise (Cic. Invent. 1. 8) seem to make it more probable that Cicero is referring to one who is dead, whereas his manual, his *ars*, is currently used everywhere.

But in 62 B. C. when Pompey returned from the Mithridatic and other eastern wars, he stopped over at Rhodes: he had been out of the senate and away from the capital full five years, for he had not returned to Rome after the pirate war of 67. At Rhodes then Pompey heard lectures from old

Posidonius on rhetoric. I cite from Plut. Pomp. 42; 'In Rhodes Pompey heard all the scholars and gave each one a present of a talent; but Posidonius even composed or wrote out the lecture which he held before him, having prepared it *in reply to Hermagoras*, about the principles of rhetoric in general'. This *πρὸς Ἑρμαγόραν* of Plutarch's text has deceived the editors of Cicero's Brutus and many others. One can hold a lecture in reply to, or in rejoinder to or for subversal of the current doctrine or theory of the most eminent representative of a widely prevailing system, without having that authority present in the flesh, or even alive. But this Jahn and the others overlooked and thus created impossibilities. There *was* a theory of *status* everywhere, but it seems the *τεχνουργοί* not always accepted the classification of Hermagoras. In Quintil. 3. 6. 31 ff. Some put two, as did Appollodorus (who taught Octavianus); so also Theodorus though with a radically different theory. And then Posidonius himself is named, who had also two large classes of *στάσεις*.

But this will do to clear the matter.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

E. G. SIHLER.

LITERATURE VERSUS PHILOLOGY

For some time in public discussion and private conversation a wordy war has been waged between the partisans of Literature on the one side and the partisans of Philology on the other, while those who have not felt called upon to take either side have stood apart and watched the fray, either as spectators interested in the outcome, or as mere lovers of a good fight. As is usual in wars many of the warriors in either camp do not understand what the fight is all about, but having taken sides, they are doing their best to put their antagonists out of business. It is the leaders—and by these we mean those who have written on the subject for publication—who are stirring up all the disturbance. Yet even in their case one cannot help feeling that some of them are as bewildered in respect of the real point at issue as are many of the rank and file.

The leaders on the side of literature say that their opponents, whom they stigmatize as 'narrow philologists' and 'gerund-grinders', do not teach literature in such a way as to ennoble and enrich the minds of their pupils, but give them the dry husks of a dead and deadening study of the dry bones of an inanimate skeleton, while the 'narrow philologist', thus rudely awakened from his intensive study of this 'subject' which we call language, is beginning to fight in self-defense, at the same time casting about in his mind for good and valid arguments by using which as a club he may pound some sense into the heads of his adversaries.

In this, as in every question debatable with arguments or fists, there are two sides, and if we can

call a halt in the conflict we may be able to show to all concerned that they really agree in all essentials as well as in most of the details.

Literature—in the dictionaries there are many definitions—is that which is written in the noblest language and gives enlightenment and pleasure in their noblest forms. No one, not even the philologist, will for a moment deny that the study of literature, as thus defined, will be of exceeding value to the student. Yet, in spite of the fact that there are high-school pupils who 'understand Shakespeare perfectly', it is true that literature cannot be understood, or even enjoyed, until the mind of the pupil has been educated by easy, not *too* easy, stages to the point where it can feel the thrill of pleasure which comes from association with the best minds through the medium of the best literature.

Now everyone thinks that he understands his mother-tongue; some are even conceited enough to say that they understand two or more languages, but when a test is made the subject is brought to see that he did not know what it was 'to understand'. Hence the need for English, Course A, and Rhetoric, Course B, as well as for courses in other languages; hence the need for the intensive study of mere words that the student may be sure that from the possible meanings he can choose the one which will fit in any given case. A *brown* hat is something we have all seen, but what does Dante mean when he says, "e l'aer *bruno* toglieva gli animai"? One might make a guess and pass on—to other guesses, but if he does he will not understand the poet. The answer to this might be that the teacher's duty is to make such explanation as is necessary to insure clear understanding on the part of the pupil. 'No', answers the philologist, 'for how does the teacher know that he is right? Does he hand down a continuous, unbroken tradition from the poet? How does the pupil know that the teacher gives the correct interpretation? In your statement lies the crux of the whole question. Tradition deadens, while investigation gives life. Points once seemingly settled must be reinvestigated by every age, lest the very life of thought die and the human mind shrivel'.

If we seek for side-lights to aid us in finding a solution of our question and turn to the natural sciences for help, everywhere we find minute and painstaking pursuit of knowledge. The scientist of to-day is not content with the theories and explanations of the past; the physician of to-day is not the physician of to-morrow, unless he is content to be left behind in the march of progress. Not only does science seek for a knowledge of facts which may at once be made of practical value to many, but it studies matters whose practical value it would be very difficult to demonstrate to any but the initiated. The young student is at first set at performing experiments which have been performed by thousands of